

## DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL TRAITS

### IMPACTING DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT IN INDIA

NAMRATA KAPUR & B JANAKIRAM

<sup>1</sup>Reserach Scholar, Department of Business Studies, MSRT, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Business Studies, Nitte Meenakshi Institute of Technology, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

#### ABSTRACT

*India Ranks in top 5 FDI destinations and accounts for 5.5% of global FDI. (Sources: fDi Intelligence; EY's 2014 India attractiveness survey). Recent reforms in support of global investments and MNC's include the raised FDI ceilings for the retail, airline, telecoms, financial and defense sectors. The future competitiveness of the country will depend on it's ability to attract and manage diverse talents effectively. To capitalize on these benefits of diversity, leaders are being advised to incorporate managerial traits needed to promote and manage 'Diverse' organizations and diverse people . This is a descriptive and quantitative research carried out in the IT and non IT cos of India to study the managerial traits and how the various dimensions of diversity viz. Gender, Age, marital status , Education, department, experience, grade level and ethnicity affect these. A stratified random sampling technique is employed in the present research and the results were interpreted using SPSS statistical techniques like Cronbach's Alpha and Mann Whitney test. The findings highlight that whilst Marital status, Language, Education, Department, Experience, and Grade level and Ethnicity have significant effect on the managerial traits (Diversity orientation, Communication, Flexibility and self awareness ) needed for Diversity management , the gender has none and age has minimal. Furthermore, it was found that for communication trait there is no significant difference across dimensions whereas the Diversity orientation trait is influenced by 5 dimensions, flexibility trait by 7 and self awareness trait by 4. The marital status , Education, department, experience, grade level and ethnicity were greatest common influences on majority of the managerial traits .*

**KEYWORDS:** Diversity, Dimensions, Managerial Traits, Diversity Orientation, Communication, Flexibility and Self awareness

**Received:** Jan 25, 2016; **Accepted:** Feb 06, 2016; **Published:** Feb 12, 2016; **Paper Id.:** IJHRMRFEB20166

## INTRODUCTION

### INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In India employees hail from different regions, religions, linguistic traditions, castes, communities, culinary tastes, races and genders. Further complexity lent by the great variation across the population on social parameters such as income and education A generational difference adds another layer of complexity. Even as the world is graying, India is getting younger. More than 60% population above 30 yrs. There are 216 languages with more than 10,000 native speakers in India. More than two thousand ethnic groups. Only the continent of Africa exceeds the linguistic, genetic and cultural diversity of the nation of India. By the beginning of 2016, the Indian economy expected to be worth US\$2.4t (INR129t) and the country's population is set to reach 1.3 billion. Share of IT & non IT industrial Sectors in total employment is 51.1% as against 48.9 % in Agriculture & allied sectors and the contribution to economy inputs is 88.2% as against 11.8% respectively . Also percentage of share of major exports by the IT & non IT sector has been 63.3% as against 13.7% only for agriculture sector .Favorable demographics and recent government reforms are expected to

accelerate expansion , making India the world's fifth-fastest growing economy by 2015.

In most companies in India - awareness of the challenges of a diverse workforce is still at a very nascent stage. If Indian organizations do not awaken to this issue fast and take the necessary steps, they will lose their best talent and their competitive edge .

### **Primary/ Internal Dimensions**

There are 4 main primary or internal dimensions of diversity which influence our early socialization process and have a sustained influence throughout our life cycle. These are more explicitly visible to others even before we open our mouth and hence when people are stereotyped on these dimensions they are less sensitive about it. These are;

- Gender
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Age
- Marital status
- **Secondary/ External dimensions**

There are 6 main external dimensions which play an important role in shaping our expectations and experiences. They are less visible to others around us, more variable in nature and less powerful as we keep on acquiring , discarding and modifying these. But at the same time people are more sensitive when stereotyped on the basis of these. These are ;

- Education
- Income
- work experiences
- communication style
- Religion
- Language

### **Organizational Dimensions**

The environment within the organization includes the major organizational dimensions which brings forth the benefits realized out of diversity. All employees should feel welcome and valued for what they bring to the organization .

- Department
- Geographical Location
- Tenure

- Grade level

Edward Hubbard((2004)in his book "Manager's pocket guide to diversity" recommends a pocket guide for managers to build diversity skills and create high performing work environment. It is an interactive work book to test the skills , teach or reinforce diversity concepts and knowledge and provide tools ,processes and techniques improve organization performance. Includes the applications of key diversity initiatives , strategies for boosting productivity , approaches for managing the diversity change process and building blocks of personal action plans

Daugherty D, A. Varanelli & E. Weisbord (2000) in his research paper indicates a need for curricular revision that includes diversity competencies. The research and corresponding analysis is presented in two parts, corresponding to two phases of research- the impact of the organization on diverse groups and the impact of diverse groups on the organization. Research within the former category focuses on the difficulty that organizations have in providing fair treatment to diverse groups with differing needs and on the challenges of managing heterogeneous groups. The latter category (i.e., the impact of diverse groups on the organization) largely argues for the potential benefits that are posited to derive from diversity in organizations.

Riach, K. (2009) in his journal paper seeks to explore how age diversity is characterized, understood and managed by HR managers responsible for its implementation. With businesses competing at a global level and demographic trends changing the landscape of the labor market, the diversity approach to managing workplace equality has been heralded as the answer. Drawing from interview data with HR managers from a range of industry backgrounds, this article explores the inherent tensions faced when discussing age as a diversity issue, and the persistent effects of larger social norms related to aging.. This leads to a discussion about the more subtle practices involved in the workplace implementation of age diversity and how awareness of inherent biases may challenge age inequality within organizations.

Cooke, F. L. and Saini, D. S. (2010) in their paper explain that strategically managing workforce diversity is a value-adding HR function that enhances organizational performance. This paper contributes to existing knowledge on diversity management and strategic HRM in the Indian context through an in-depth case study of 24 firms of different ownership forms in a number of industries in India. The main method of data collection was semi-structured interviews . Results reveal the differences between Western MNCs and Eastern firms as well as the varying views of Indian managers and employees on issues related to diversity management.

Jonathan Passmore(2013) in his paper emphasizes that it is increasingly important for today's business managers, especially senior executives in global companies, to raise their awareness of cultural competence through coaching. To unpack such complexity, it is therefore important for international coaches to formulate a cross-cultural model as part of their coaching framework, as well as consider issues of gender and generational differences. Traditional coaching and training models are no longer effective if they do not consider diversity as a theme for inter group relationships

## OBJECTIVES

To study the managerial traits required for Diversity management in the Indian context in IT and non IT employees and find out how these vary with dimensions such as- Gender, Age, marital status , Education, department, experience, grade level and ethnicity.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Population, Sample Unit, Sample Size

- Initial Pilot testing of the questionnaire with a total of 35 employees of the senior manager level in industries (Manufacturing, IT , Pharma, ITES, R&D etc.) to find out their opinion on managerial traits for Diversity management practices in India .
- The pilot tested questionnaire after being subjected to reliability analysis was further distributed to another set of 70 employees of manager/ Team lead level thereby yielding a total sample size of 103 .

### Sampling Technique & Data Type

Non-probability stratified random sampling method was used to collect primary data from the respondents.

### Data Collection Tools

Structured questionnaire was prepared for the collection of primary data consisting of five (5) point likert scale questions ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5) on the below mentioned traits ;

- Diversity orientation(6 questions)
- Communication(8 questions)
- Flexibility(7 questions)
- Self awareness (7 questions)

### Data Analysis Tools

- The collected data is coded and tabulated
- SPSS software used for further analysis of data.
- Reliability of the data collected is assessed by applying the Cronbach Alpha method.
- Mann Whitney test

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND EMPERICAL RESULTS

### Reliability Analysis of Questionnaire

Table 1

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	No Items
.941	.942	71

Cronbach alpha for the questionnaire resulted in a value of 94.2% per cent showing high reliability of scale measurement. Further statistical analysis was done through Mann Whitney test to arrive at significant findings of the study.

### Mann-Whitney Test

The Mann Whitney U test was conducted after carefully satisfying the assumptions for this test. These are;

- Dependent variable should be measured at the ordinal or continuous level. Here ordinal variables include Likert items (A 5 point scale from "strongly agree" through to "strongly disagree" has been used)
- Independent variable should consist of two categorical, independent groups. Here we have included gender (2 groups: male or female), marital status (2 groups: married or unmarried) etc.
- Independence of observations, which means that there must be different participants in each group with no participant being in more than one group.
- The variables are not normally distributed.

### Trait 1- DIVERSITY ORIENTATION

#### Mann-Whitney Test(Gender)

Table 2

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>					
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5
Mann-Whitney U	1108.000	1054.500	1063.500	1045.500	901.000
Wilcoxon W	1636.000	3610.500	3619.500	1573.500	1429.000
Z	-.217	-.635	-.580	-.729	-1.822
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.828	.525	.562	.466	.068
a. Grouping Variable: GENDER					

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation in the Male group was statistically no significantly different than the female group ( $p > .05$ )

#### Mann-Whitney Test(AGE->35 YRS, <35 YRS )

Table 3

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>						
	DIV_1 Demonstration of Diversity by Aleader	DIV_2 Discusses Diversity as a Strength in Organisation	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_6
Mann-Whitney U	1114.000	1202.500	1179.500	961.500	1243.000	839.500
Wilcoxon W	1934.000	2022.500	3195.500	2977.500	2063.000	1659.500
Z	-1.075	-.425	-.612	-2.282	-.125	-3.340
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.283	.671	.541	.023	.900	.001
a. Grouping Variable: AGE						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation in the <35 age group was statistically significantly different than the >35 age group ( $p < .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test(Marital status)****Table 4**

Test Statistics						
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_6
Mann-Whitney U	806.500	520.000	745.500	836.000	818.000	626.000
Wilcoxon W	1131.500	845.000	1070.500	1161.000	1143.000	951.000
Z	-1.410	-3.827	-1.983	-1.208	-1.314	-3.151
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.159	.000	.047	.227	.189	.002
a. Grouping Variable: MARITALSTATUS						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation with regards to the diversity discussions and business advantages of diversity in the Married group was statistically significantly different than the unmarried group ( $p = .00$  and  $0.002$  which is  $<.05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test(Education- Engineer vs. Non Engineer)****Table 5**

Test Statistics						
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_6
Mann-Whitney U	1013.500	1111.500	972.000	1088.000	1152.000	1117.500
Wilcoxon W	1574.500	1672.500	3457.000	3573.000	1713.000	1678.500
Z	-1.088	-.336	-1.453	-.535	-.023	-.311
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.277	.737	.146	.593	.982	.756
a. Grouping Variable: EDUCATION						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation the Engineer group was NO statistically different than the non Engineer group ( $p > .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test(Position -Manager vs. Leads)****Table 6**

Test Statistics						
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_7
Mann-Whitney U	1149.500	1251.000	1116.000	1045.000	1257.000	862.000
Wilcoxon W	2277.500	2379.000	2712.000	2641.000	2385.000	1990.000
Z	-1.199	-.471	-1.488	-2.027	-.425	-3.528
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.231	.638	.137	.043	.671	.000
a. Grouping Variable: POSITION						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation Role of a leader in promoting and popularizing diversity measures in the Manager group was statistically significantly different than the Lead group ( $p < .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test(DEPT -IT vs non IT )****Table 7**

Test Statistics						
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_6
Mann-Whitney U	1305.000	1001.000	1088.500	1007.500	1151.000	1257.500
Wilcoxon W	2433.000	2129.000	2216.500	2135.500	2747.000	2853.500
Z	-.079	-2.281	-1.692	-2.307	-1.189	-.455
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.937	.023	.091	.021	.235	.649
a. Grouping Variable: DEPT						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation -Role of a leader in promoting and popularizing diversity measures in the IT group was statistically significantly different than the NON IT group (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test( EXPERIENCE->10 yrs vs <10 yrs )****Table 8**

Test Statistics						
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_6
Mann-Whitney U	905.500	1132.500	1198.500	1186.000	1111.000	921.000
Wilcoxon W	1895.500	2122.500	2968.500	2956.000	2101.000	1911.000
Z	-2.846	-1.207	-.745	-.844	-1.356	-2.950
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.228	.456	.399	.175	.003
a. Grouping Variable: EXPERIENCE						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation – Demonstration of valuing diversity by a leader and explaining it's business advantages in the More experienced group was statistically significantly different than the less experienced group (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test(ETHNICITY – North Indians vs. South Indians )****Table 9**

Test Statistics						
	DIV_1	DIV_2	DIV_3	DIV_4	DIV_5	DIV_6
Mann-Whitney U	974.500	1073.000	1215.000	1263.500	1031.000	1120.500
Wilcoxon W	2352.500	2451.000	2593.000	2641.500	2409.000	2498.500
Z	-2.522	-1.825	-.823	-.466	-2.117	-1.591
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.068	.411	.641	.034	.112
a. Grouping Variable: ETHNICITY						

From this data, it can be concluded that diversity orientation – **Demonstration of valuing diversity by a leader and sparking excitement** in the North ethnic group was statistically significantly different than the South ethnic group (  $p < .05$  )

**Trait 2- COMMUNICATION****Mann-Whitney Test (AGE->35 vs <35))****Table 10**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	1227.000	1252.500	1176.000	1244.500	1245.000	1219.500	1089.000	1090.000
Wilcoxon W	3243.000	3268.500	1996.000	2064.500	3261.000	2039.500	3105.000	3106.000
Z	-.257	-.057	-.623	-.116	-.113	-.307	-1.314	-1.361
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.797	.955	.533	.908	.910	.759	.189	.174

a. Grouping Variable: AGE

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for all age groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (GENDER)****Table 11**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	1102.000	1082.000	1083.000	1021.500	1061.000	1050.500	1086.000	936.000
Wilcoxon W	1630.000	1610.000	1611.000	1549.500	1589.000	3606.500	1614.000	1464.000
Z	-.279	-.429	-.414	-.903	-.597	-.682	-.405	-1.686
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.780	.668	.679	.366	.550	.495	.686	.092

a. Grouping Variable: GENDER

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both Gender groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (MARITAL STATUS)****Table 12**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	933.000	902.500	771.000	789.500	970.000	740.500	960.000	867.500
Wilcoxon W	1258.000	1227.500	1096.000	1114.500	4051.000	1065.500	4041.000	1192.500
Z	-.372	-.622	-1.720	-1.580	-.043	-2.020	-.131	-.978
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.710	.534	.085	.114	.966	.043	.896	.328

a. Grouping Variable: MARITALSTATUS

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both marital status groups (  $p > .05$  )



**Mann-Whitney Test (Education)****Table 13**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	1019.000	1096.500	1059.000	1120.500	1147.500	1090.500	1102.000	1110.500
Wilcoxon W	1580.000	1657.500	3544.000	1681.500	1708.500	1651.500	1663.000	3595.500
Z	-1.107	-.461	-.744	-.270	-.059	-.510	-.425	-.372
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.268	.645	.457	.787	.953	.610	.670	.710
a. Grouping Variable: EDUCATION								

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both Education status groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Position)****Table 14**

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>									
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8	CUL_1
Mann-Whitney U	1240.500	1309.500	1129.000	1237.000	1298.500	1255.000	1208.500	1224.500	1263.000
Wilcoxon W	2836.500	2905.500	2257.000	2365.000	2426.500	2851.000	2804.500	2820.500	2391.000
Z	-.576	-.048	-1.357	-.579	-.129	-.452	-.808	-.717	-.378
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.565	.962	.175	.563	.897	.651	.419	.474	.705
a. Grouping Variable: POSITION									

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both manager and lead groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Dept)****Table 15**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	1240.500	1286.500	976.000	1108.000	1283.000	1180.500	1140.500	1303.000
Wilcoxon W	2368.500	2414.500	2104.000	2236.000	2879.000	2776.500	2736.500	2431.000
Z	-.576	-.218	-2.467	-1.525	-.244	-1.005	-1.320	-.102
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.565	.828	.014	.127	.807	.315	.187	.919
a. Grouping Variable: DEPT								

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both Departmental groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Experience )****Table 16**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	1249.000	1279.000	1159.000	1149.500	1179.000	1175.500	1056.000	1255.500
Wilcoxon W	3019.000	3049.000	2149.000	2139.500	2949.000	2945.500	2826.000	3025.500
Z	-.376	-.141	-1.016	-1.096	-.887	-.914	-1.833	-.335
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.707	.888	.310	.273	.375	.360	.067	.737
a. Grouping Variable: EXPERIENCE								

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both experience groups ( $p > .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Ethnicity)****Table 17**

Test Statistics								
	COMM_1	COMM_2	COMM_3	COMM_4	COMM_5	COMM_6	COMM_7	COMM_8
Mann-Whitney U	1176.000	1282.500	1287.000	1153.000	1071.000	1310.000	1308.500	1319.000
Wilcoxon W	2554.000	2660.500	2665.000	2531.000	2449.000	2636.000	2634.500	2645.000
Z	-1.139	-.320	-.282	-1.263	-1.880	-.118	-.131	-.055
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.255	.749	.778	.206	.060	.906	.896	.956
a. Grouping Variable: ETHNICITY								

From this data, it can be concluded that communication trait for a diversity manager hold equal importance for both ethnicity groups ( $p > .05$ )

**Trait 3- FLEXIBILITY****Mann-Whitney Test (Age)****Table 18**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	1179.500	942.500	1093.500	864.500	1193.000	847.500	768.000
Wilcoxon W	3195.500	2958.500	3109.500	2880.500	3209.000	2863.500	2784.000
Z	-.621	-2.408	-1.269	-2.944	-.531	-3.045	-3.584
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.535	.016	.204	.003	.596	.002	.000
a. Grouping Variable: AGE							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both AGE groups ( $p < .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Gender)****Table 19**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	1003.500	980.000	975.500	948.500	1125.000	922.000	1103.500
Wilcoxon W	3559.500	1508.000	1503.500	1476.500	1653.000	1450.000	1631.500
Z	-1.076	-1.246	-1.288	-1.470	-.092	-1.664	-.249
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.282	.213	.198	.142	.927	.096	.803
a. Grouping Variable: GENDER							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait for a diversity manager DO not significantly differ for both gender groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Marital status)****Table 20**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	824.000	858.000	969.500	694.500	819.500	750.000	608.000
Wilcoxon W	1149.000	3939.000	4050.500	3775.500	1144.500	3831.000	3689.000
Z	-1.324	-1.009	-.048	-2.373	-1.400	-1.888	-3.039
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.185	.313	.962	.018	.161	.059	.002
a. Grouping Variable: MARITALSTATUS							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait – for team members emotions and their perspectives for a diversity manager are significantly different for both marital status groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Education)****Table 21**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	715.500	931.500	1099.500	1010.000	1023.500	954.000	1041.500
Wilcoxon W	1276.500	1492.500	1660.500	1571.000	1584.500	3439.000	1602.500
Z	-3.541	-1.771	-.442	-1.127	-1.088	-1.550	-.864
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.077	.659	.260	.277	.121	.388
a. Grouping Variable: EDUCATION							

From this data, it can be concluded that the flexibility trait for a diversity manager do not differ significantly for both Engineer and non Engineer groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Position)****Table 22**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	1298.500	1204.500	1142.000	1091.000	1107.000	1142.000	937.000
Wilcoxon W	2426.500	2800.500	2738.000	2687.000	2703.000	2738.000	2533.000
Z	-.132	-.827	-1.298	-1.639	-1.620	-1.257	-2.702
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.895	.408	.194	.101	.105	.209	.007
a. Grouping Variable: POSITION							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait – open to others ideas even if they in conflict of his for a diversity manager vary significantly for both AGE groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Dept)****Table 23**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	1047.000	1140.500	1281.000	1236.500	1259.500	1279.000	1191.000
Wilcoxon W	2175.000	2736.500	2409.000	2832.500	2387.500	2407.000	2319.000
Z	-2.031	-1.302	-.261	-.579	-.438	-.267	-.891
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	.193	.794	.563	.661	.789	.373
a. Grouping Variable: DEPT							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait – open to other ideas for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both Dept groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Experience )****Table 24**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	1222.000	1088.000	1183.500	1257.000	1174.500	1110.000	933.500
Wilcoxon W	2212.000	2858.000	2953.500	3027.000	2944.500	2880.000	2703.500
Z	-.578	-1.569	-.860	-.301	-.964	-1.367	-2.616
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.564	.117	.390	.764	.335	.172	.009
a. Grouping Variable: EXPERIENCE							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait – open to other ideas even if they in conflict of his for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both experience groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Ethnicity)****Table 25**

Test Statistics							
	FLEX_1	FLEX_2	FLEX_3	FLEX_4	FLEX_5	FLEX_6	FLEX_7
Mann-Whitney U	982.500	1318.500	1071.000	1136.000	838.500	1105.000	1321.500
Wilcoxon W	2360.500	2696.500	2449.000	2514.000	2216.500	2431.000	2647.500
Z	-2.583	-.055	-1.894	-1.378	-3.765	-1.590	-.032
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.956	.058	.168	.000	.112	.975
a. Grouping Variable: ETHNICITY							

From this data, it can be concluded that Flexibility trait – open to other ideas even if they in conflict of his for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both ethnic groups ( $p < .05$ )

**Trait 4- SELF AWARENESS****Mann-Whitney Test (Age)****Table 26**

Test Statistics							
	SELFAWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	1087.500	1102.000	1195.000	825.000	1170.000	1139.000	1232.000
Wilcoxon W	3103.500	3118.000	3211.000	2841.000	3186.000	3155.000	2052.000
Z	-1.280	-1.180	-.482	-3.285	-.676	-.917	-.204
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.201	.238	.630	.001	.499	.359	.838
a. Grouping Variable: AGE							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait – reflects and learns form experiences for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both AGE groups ( $p < .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Gender)****Table 27**

Test Statistics							
	SELFAWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	967.500	910.000	1008.000	837.500	1025.000	904.000	990.000
Wilcoxon W	1495.500	1438.000	1536.000	1365.500	1553.000	1432.000	1518.000
Z	-1.317	-1.778	-.999	-2.374	-.878	-1.852	-1.120
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.188	.075	.318	.018	.380	.064	.263
a. Grouping Variable: GENDER							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait – reflects and learns form experiences for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both Gender groups ( $p < .05$ )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Marital status)****Table 28**

Test Statistics							
	SELFAWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	937.500	839.500	825.500	742.500	923.000	950.500	797.000
Wilcoxon W	4018.500	1164.500	1150.500	3823.500	4004.000	4031.500	1122.000
Z	-.316	-1.151	-1.259	-1.996	-.444	-.211	-1.473
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.752	.250	.208	.046	.657	.833	.141
a. Grouping Variable: MARITALSTATUS							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait – reflects and learns form experiences for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both Marital status groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Education)****Table 29**

Test Statistics							
	SELFAWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	1081.500	1061.500	1001.500	1145.500	1136.500	1090.500	937.000
Wilcoxon W	3566.500	3546.500	1562.500	1706.500	1697.500	1651.500	3422.000
Z	-.570	-.730	-1.188	-.075	-.145	-.511	-1.658
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.569	.466	.235	.940	.885	.610	.097
a. Grouping Variable: EDUCATION							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait for a diversity manager does not vary significantly for both Education groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Position)****Table 30**

Test Statistics							
	SELFAWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	1304.500	1293.500	1153.500	1005.500	1213.000	1057.500	1252.000
Wilcoxon W	2900.500	2889.500	2749.500	2601.500	2809.000	2653.500	2380.000
Z	-.083	-.164	-1.178	-2.294	-.757	-1.917	-.456
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.933	.869	.239	.022	.449	.055	.648
a. Grouping Variable: POSITION							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait – reflects and learns form experiences for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both position groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Dept.)****Table 31**

Test Statistics							
	SELF_AWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	1242.000	1257.000	1140.000	1250.500	1211.500	1119.000	1310.000
Wilcoxon W	2370.000	2385.000	2268.000	2378.500	2339.500	2715.000	2438.000
Z	-.537	-.431	-1.276	-.484	-.768	-1.461	-.043
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.591	.666	.202	.628	.442	.144	.966
a. Grouping Variable: DEPT							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait for a diversity manager does not vary significantly for both Department groups (  $p > .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Experience )****Table 32**

Test Statistics							
	SELF_AWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	1286.500	1252.000	1267.000	969.000	1293.000	993.000	1007.000
Wilcoxon W	3056.500	3022.000	2257.000	2739.000	2283.000	2763.000	1997.000
Z	-.084	-.339	-.226	-2.448	-.037	-2.277	-2.088
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.933	.735	.821	.014	.970	.023	.037
a. Grouping Variable: EXPERIENCE							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait – reflects and learns form experience, awareness of his temperament, beliefs , does not engage in self pride for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both position groups (  $p < .05$  )

**Mann-Whitney Test (Ethnicity)****Table 33**

Test Statistics							
	SELF_AWARE_1	SELF_2	SELF_3	SELF_4	SELF_5	SELF_6	SELF_7
Mann-Whitney U	1225.000	1277.500	1012.500	1175.000	1251.000	1288.500	1296.000
Wilcoxon W	2603.000	2655.500	2390.500	2501.000	2629.000	2666.500	2622.000
Z	-.730	-.353	-2.265	-1.112	-.549	-.277	-.213
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.465	.724	.024	.266	.583	.782	.831
a. Grouping Variable: ETHNICITY							

From this data, it can be concluded that Self awareness trait –aware of own negative feelings before reacting for a diversity manager hold significantly different for both position groups (  $p < .05$  )

**INTERPRETATION**

The below table shows a summary of the relation between the diversity dimensions and managerial traits.

Relationship between the Diversity dimensions and managerial traits

**Table 34**

<b>Managerial Trait</b>	<b>Diversity Dimension</b>								<b>Significant Difference</b>
Diversity orientation	Gender N*	Age Y*	Marital status Y	Education N	Position Y	Department Y	Experience Y	Ethnicity Y	<b>Marital status, Education, Position, Dept, Experience, ethnicity</b>
Communication	Gender N	Age N	Marital status N	Education N	Position N	Department N	Experience N	Ethnicity N	<b>Dept.</b>
Flexibility	Gender N	Age Y	Marital status Y	Education Y	Position Y	Department Y	Experience Y	Ethnicity Y	<b>Age, Marital status, Education, Position, Dept, Experience, ethnicity</b>
Self awareness	Gender N	Age N	Marital status Y	Education N	Position Y	Department N	Experience Y	Ethnicity Y	<b>Marital status, Position, Experience, ethnicity</b>

\*Y=YES, N=NO

## CONCLUSIONS

The diversity dimensions are critical and important factors influencing the managerial traits in diversity management and there is a need to focus upon by the companies on further grooming these where the variance of these is more as highlighted in this study. This study leads to revisiting these dimensions and traits and reconsidering some of the old perceptions and belief systems and their influence on the HR diversity initiatives.

## REFERENCES

1. Bodley, J. H. (1999). *Cultural anthropology: Tribes, states, and the global system*(3rd ed.). United Kingdom: Mayfield Publishing Company.
2. 20. Baugher D., A. Varanelli & E. Weisbord (2000) ,*Gender and culture diversity in self-formed workgroups* .*Journal of Managerial Issues* vol. XII no. 4 pp. 391-407
3. Cox, T. (2001) *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Koehler.
4. Cooke, F. L. and Saini, D. S. (2010), *Diversity management in India: A study of organizations in different ownership forms and industrial sectors*. *Human Resource Management* 49:477–500, Wiley Periodicals
5. Dr. Edward E Hubbard(2004).*Manager's pocket guide to diversity*, HRD press. Inc



6. Dowling, P.J. & Welch, D.E. (2004). *International Human Resource Management – Managing People in a Multicultural context*. Singapore: Thomas Learning.
7. Esty, Katharine, Richard Griffin, and Marcie Schorr-Hirsh (1995). *Workplace diversity. A managers guide to solving problems and turning diversity into a competitive advantage*. Avon, MA: Adams Media Corporation.
8. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
9. Higgs, M. (1996). *Overcoming the Problems of Cultural Differences to Establish Success for International Management Teams*. *Team Performance Management, An International Journal*, 2(1), 36-43.
10. Jackson, T. (2002). *International HRM: A Cross-Cultural Approach*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
11. Jonathan Passmore (2013) *Diversity in Coaching*, 2nd Edition Kogan Page Publisher
12. Johanna Hofbauer, Astrid Podsiadlowski.(2014). *Envisioning inclusive organizations*. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 1.3 , 33 ( 3), 214-219
13. Monks, K., Scullion, H., & Creaner, J. (2001). *HRM in international firms: evidence from Ireland*. *Personnel Review*, 30(5), 536-553.

